



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/638,982	08/12/2003	Donald A. Ice	15436.75.1.1	6290

22913 7590 07/08/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER
(F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY)
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUNG THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2841

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PA

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/638,982		ICE, DONALD A.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	HUNG T. NGUYEN		2841	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, 8 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pusateri et al. (US 6008995) in view of Wetherbee (US 4068290)

Regard to claim 1, 8 and 13: Pusateri et al. disclose in figure 5 a functional module configured to be received in an electronic equipment enclosure that includes a card cage, the functional module comprising: a front panel (110); a card that includes electronic circuitry (components shown on card 104 figure 5), the card having two side edges (106, 108) and being attached to the front panel (110), and the card being supported by the card cage at its two side edges (106, 108), as well as at a location between the side edges (Wetherbee teaches this limitation as discuss below) when the functional module is received in the electronic equipment enclosure; and at least one connector attached to the card (102) and configured for electrical communication with the electronic circuitry. However, Pusateri et al. do not disclose the card being supported at a location between the side edges.

Wetherbee disclose the card being supported at a location between the side edges (18, 18" as shown in figure 1).

Art Unit: 2841

Pusateri et al and Wetherbee et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to make board to insert or remove from card case.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to have the card being supported at a location between the side edges (106, 108) as taught by Wetherbee.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Wetherbee on column 2, line 61-64 that the supported between the side edges can be placed so as to accommodate cards at their normal spacing from one another with substantial lateral rigidity.

Regard claim 2, 9, 16: Pusateri et al. disclose all elements in claim 1, 8 and 13 above in addition to figure 6 the functional module wherein the card is at least double-wide (104).

Regard claim 3, 11, 12, 14, 15: Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pusateri et al. (US 6008995) and Wetherbee (US 4068290) in further view of Reynol et al. (US 3733523)

Pusateri et al and Wetherbee disclose all elements of claim 1, 8 and 13 above except

ce Pusateri et al. and Wetherbee et al. do not disclose the functional module wherein the card defines at least one cutout (middle end, corner end portion of card board 65) configured and arranged to engage a portion of the card cage (10) proximate the location between the side edges (106, 108) of the card (104).

Reynolds et al. disclose in figure 1 the card defines at least one cutout (middle end, corner end portion of card board 65) configured and arranged to engage a portion of the

Art Unit: 2841

card cage (10) proximate the location between the side edges (106, 108) of the card (104).

Pusateri et al., Wetherbee and Reynolds et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to make card board and card cage.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to make the cutout as taught by Reynolds et al.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Reynolds et al. to have better support, to reduce materials, space and weight.

Regard claim 4, 10: Wetherbee disclose all elements in claim 1, 8 and 13 above in addition to figure 1 the functional module wherein the card (14) is supported by the card cage (10) at a second location (18') between the side edges

Regard claim 5, 17: Pusateri et al. disclose all elements in claim 1, 8 and 13 above in addition to figure 5 and 3a the functional module further comprising at least two fasteners (114) that pass through the front panel (110) and are configured to removable engage the card cage (10), each of the fasteners (110) defining a circumferential slot (80) and comprising: an e-clip (72) substantially disposed in the circumferential slot (80); and a spring (72) disposed about a portion of the fastener (114)

Regard claim 6: Pusateri et al. disclose all elements in claim 1, 8, and 13 above in addition to figure 5 the functional module wherein the at least one connector (112) is located proximate the front panel (110).

Art Unit: 2841

Regard claim 7: the functional module wherein the at least one connector (102) is located proximate a rear edge of the card (110).

Relevant Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Cantrell (US 5642264) teaches the chassis having unique configuration for different size of card boards, Butterbaugh et al. teaches the chassis has at least one card slots (US 6335868), Gomez et al. teaches PCBs have different size and at least one PCB in the chassis.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-5983. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KAMMIE CUNEO can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

HN

Hung Thanh Nguyen

July 4, 2005


KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2300

Application/Control Number: 10/638,982
Art Unit: 2841

Page 6